

**BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of June 19, 2012 Meeting**

Elliot Mann opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at **3:07 p.m. on Tuesday, June 19, 2012.**

**Present:** Bernice Cutler, Harry Sherrill, Travis Haston, Ed Horne, Zeke Acosta, John Taylor, Rob Belisle, Kevin Silva, Elliot Mann and John Wood

**Absent:** Tim West, Hal Hester and Jon Morris

## **1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

*The motion by Harry Sherrill seconded by Elliot Mann to approve the May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2012 meeting minutes passed unanimously.*

## **2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS**

**Zeke Acosta** mentioned his concern regarding mechanical requirements when reroofing a house or condo. He is finding 50 – 60% not passing and wondered if we have heard anything else from other contractors experiencing the same problem.

**Kevin Silva** thanked Jim and the Department for working hard on Plan Review.

**Harry Sherrill** noticed that we are making changes to Appendix B; which are good changes. Discussion ensued regarding Mecklenburg County Appendix B vs. the State Appendix B. Jim noted that this is something that would have to be pushed out by the State; which is not likely to happen. Harry asked if we could identify on the web site that Mecklenburg County Appendix B is different than the DOI Appendix B. Jim shared that we can identify on the web site that our Appendix B is different than the State's Appendix B.

**Elliot Mann** thanked Patrick, Jim and their team for their work and effort on RDS. Feedback has been that everyone is trying hard to accommodate and do the right thing to help.

**Ed Horne** shared that the NCAEC are working to have some their people listed as qualifiers.

## **3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES**

No public attendee comments or issues.

## **4. WEB PAGE MAINTENANCE STRATEGY UPDATE**

Geri Walton talked about the Code Enforcement web site strategy. She went on to say that our web site is very important in communicating and providing information to our customers as to how we do business. Senior Management of Code Enforcement has decided that maintaining the website must stay at the content manager level which is composed of mostly Management throughout the department. Therefore, we will not engage interns or temporary employees to maintain the LUESA-Code Enforcement web-pages. Web site reports will be run and reviewed on a quarterly basis, such as which pages are mostly used by our customers. We will meet semi-annually to review the sites along with the supporting empirical data to make recommendations on changes and updates to the LUESA-Code Enforcement website. All website changes will be referred to the CE-Technology Leadership Team for action as appropriate which is comprised of the following members; Kathleen Batey, Jeff Griffin, Gary Mullis, Melanie Sellers, Rebecca Simcox, Joe Weathers; Facilitator – Geri Walton.

## **5. RDS TURNAROUND TIMES**

Tim Taylor shared that on June 1<sup>st</sup> after the last BDC meeting we sent out a letter to all residential customers updating them on RDS; highlighting some of the things we are proposing to address specifically noting; the current review turnaround times, the status on adding new PTE resources to the effort, the move to screen drawings, we offered two alternate permitting strategies, a reminder of the Residential Professional Certification Program, Reminded Raleigh approved e-master plans will be accepted in Mecklenburg County and Noted still working on getting 3<sup>rd</sup> party review resourced online. Also on June 13<sup>th</sup> we hired 2 PTEs working 16 hours per week to help in the paper plans and the master plans. We are shifting some commercial resources to RDS and on June 25<sup>th</sup> we will reallocate staff from the commercial plan review side (2 full time commercial plans examiners) to work on residential plans. On June 18<sup>th</sup> we proposed to the LUESA Director to add 10 PTE positions which

will include 7 residential drawing submittal plans examiners (Inspector Level 1s) and 3 commercial plans examiners. We are working with the field inspectors to create a “Saturday Review Team” which will be made up of Mecklenburg and nearby code officials which we think could plow through about 20 plans per weekend. On June 8<sup>th</sup> we sent a letter soliciting AE interest in 3<sup>rd</sup> party review of single-family master plans. This went out to AIA Charlotte, PENC via NotifyMe to all the AEs in our system. On June 8<sup>th</sup> we also asked Raleigh to help us with e-plan review on master plans and have also contacted Wake Co., Greensboro, Winston-Salem, Asheville and Wilmington. We have posted the temporary plans examiner positions on the NCBIA web page. Currently, we have posted a lead time chart on the Residential and Townhouse web page to help the contractors and the designers know what the current work volume is. This lead time chart is updated every Monday. We have also added a document to the web site that references the most common defects that we are finding in plan review to assist our customers in preparing their drawings for submittal. As of Monday we are 13 days out on paper reviews and 23 days out on e-plan reviews.

## **6. CRWG UPDATE DETAIL WORK**

Jim shared that the subcommittee has held 4 meetings now (May 1, May 18, May 30 and June 13). In the last meeting we have agreement on how to handle the details that were assigned. Those were; combined upfit/renovation cost calculator – we’ll bring something to the BDC in the July meeting and deferring the idea of a selective mega project inspection limit count, to collect 2 years data. On the owner as contractor inspection limit counts which has actually turned into a residential homeowner as contractor revised fee structure. We’ve agreed in concept how this will work I have just finished drafting the summary memo and will send it around to all that attended the meetings (HH, JT, ZA, EH) for final comments. This will go out June 20<sup>th</sup> and we’ll bring it to the July BDC meeting to discuss with you what we are recommending and if that makes sense to you then we will probably bring you a first draft of the RFBA on the one item. If everyone agrees with the strategy for the residential homeowner permit fee structure; this is for projects less than \$30k, that is a different strategy than what we described in the RFBA that just went through so we would have to do another round of changes to the BOCC. We are making progress wrapping up details and we should have something to you in July.

## **7. DNC SPECIAL PROJECT STRATEGY**

Jim reported three items on the DNC Special Project Strategy to the BDC. An appeal of DOI interpretation to the Building Code Council, how we are going to explain things to customers then we are going to set up a special events team. We’ve been engaged in a dialogue with the NCDOT on how exactly interpret our enforcement responsibilities with respect to special events and temporary structures whether or not they are in the public right of way (street) or they are on private property. That’s turned into a disagreement between us. The DOI has proposed a scope for our enforcement responsibility which is a fairly wide reaching set of requirements and we have proposed something that is less so. We sent in our official appeal to the state (cover sheet and six pages of why we disagree with them) then officially ask the BCC to answer three questions that will explain to us what we have to do. The customer letter we thought you may be interested in; which is related and it’s going to make all our customers aware of the procedures we are to follow; in the interim until the BCC renders a decision on the three questions that we asked them and the 6 points that Chris and the department are (Chris Noles, Deputy Commissioner) arguing about. It also describes our strategy and our enforcement level depending on whether not the project is within the public right of way. The third thing is we want to identify a special events team for the DNC. There are difficult projects that are related to the DNC. The arena, things that are going to happen at the stadium; things happening out at the airport and some other projects that are being handled real well outside our current review and inspection process and we think we will be able to take care of those. They have scaled back somewhat. Many of you know it’s a 4 day convention but 1 day is at the speedway, 2 days are downtown and then the last day is at the stadium which helps us a lot. The City, Charlotte Fire, the Department and the County Fire Marshal’s office is concerned about the other things that can happen in connection with a nation convention. We’ve had 2 conference calls with the City of Tampa which is doing the Republican National Convention to get our arms around what they anticipate and how they are preparing and to match notes. In the end what we settled on was a strategy to create a special events team reaching into commercial plan review and pulling out 2 former

rehab code team members, Vikki Stokes and Howard Grindstaff and pulling them out of commercial plan review to form a special events team for the run up to the DNC. They will be supported separate from the 3 PTEs that Cary approved yesterday; 1.5 weeks ago he approved 3 commercial plan review PTEs to support this and they will cover their regular work hours for those two people that have to be assigned to this initiative and those 2 people will handle any small DNC related projects whether they are renovation projects, existing structures, temporary structures that have to be erected or special events related. They will be the people that handle it from our perspective. They will serve as our contacts from start to finish so they will start with the initial contact they will handle it through plan review they will also do any field inspections that are necessary to gain approval. Much like they did on the Rehab Code and you can start to see why we reached into the former Rehab Code Team Structure and grabbed 2 people because that's what we did for a number of years and they were really good at it so we thought they'd come up to speed, would grab the idea pretty quick, grab the idea of how we wanted to approach these. They are really good with subjective issues and they will coordinate. Dave Weekly is here along with Nan Peterson and they'll coordinate with the team that David is creating and they will coordinate with City Fire in doing their work. We are really comfortable with this plan.

## 8. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS & INITIATIVES REPORT

### Statistics Report:

#### Permit Revenue:

- May permit (only) revenue- \$1,913,729, compares to April revenue of \$1,155,078.
- Fy12 budget projected monthly permit revenue;  $\$12,127,032/12 = \$1,000,083 \times 11 = \$11,000,913$
- At 5/31/12, YTD permit rev of \$14,723,602 is above permit fee rev projection by \$3.723M, or 33%+.

#### Construction Value of Permits Issued:

- May total - \$316,715,231, with YTD amount \$2,589,679,610; vs. Fy11Total at May 31 – \$1.4308M
- So YTD figure approximately 1.159B or 81% above construction value permitted YTD at May, 2011

#### Permits Issued:

|                          | April | May  | 3 Month Trend       |
|--------------------------|-------|------|---------------------|
| <b>Residential</b>       | 3529  | 4231 | 2845/4010/3529/4231 |
| <b>Commercial</b>        | 2646  | 3279 | 2319/2576/2646/3279 |
| <b>Other (Fire/Zone)</b> | 504   | 423  | 499/561504/423      |
| <b>Total</b>             | 6679  | 7933 | 5656/7147/6679/7933 |

- Residential up 19.8%\_\_; commercial up 24%\_\_; total up 18.8%
- SF detached new construction permits YTD at 2021 vs. 1746 at 5/31/11, so up 15.7%-

#### Inspection Activity: inspections performed:

| Insp. Req.   | April  | May    | Insp. Perf.  | April  | May    | % Change |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------------|--------|--------|----------|
| <b>Bldg.</b> | 4512   | 4596   | <b>Bldg.</b> | 4467   | 4534   | +1.5%    |
| <b>Elec.</b> | 5309   | 5990   | <b>Elec.</b> | 5252   | 5919   | +12.7%   |
| <b>Mech.</b> | 2969   | 3252   | <b>Mech.</b> | 2950   | 3179   | +7.7%    |
| <b>Plbg.</b> | 2217   | 2432   | <b>Plbg.</b> | 2209   | 2413   | +9.2%    |
| <b>Total</b> | 15,007 | 16,270 | <b>Total</b> | 14,878 | 16,045 | +7.8%    |

- All trades up; from Bldg at 1.5% to Elec at 12.7%

- Overall average inspections performed counts up 7.8%
- Inspections performed were 98.6% of inspections requested

### Inspection Activity: inspections response time

| Insp.<br>Resp.<br>Time | OnTime % |      | Total % After<br>24 Hrs. Late |      | Total % After<br>48 Hrs. Late |      | Average Resp. in<br>Days |      |
|------------------------|----------|------|-------------------------------|------|-------------------------------|------|--------------------------|------|
|                        | April    | May  | April                         | May  | April                         | May  | April                    | May  |
| Bldg.                  | 92.9     | 82.0 | 94.8                          | 86.6 | 98.4                          | 92.7 | 1.14                     | 1.44 |
| Elec.                  | 91.3     | 88.4 | 92.4                          | 91.4 | 98.0                          | 96.4 | 1.19                     | 1.25 |
| Mech.                  | 93.8     | 89.2 | 95.3                          | 92.1 | 97.9                          | 96.0 | 1.13                     | 1.25 |
| Plbg.                  | 94.6     | 95.8 | 94.9                          | 96.5 | 99.1                          | 98.6 | 1.11                     | 1.09 |
| Total                  | 92.8     | 88.0 | 94.1                          | 91.0 | 98.3                          | 95.7 | 1.15                     | 1.28 |

- BEM down; Bldg down 10%, Elec down 3%, Mech down 4%; Plbg up 1%
- Overall average position down about 5%, but still within 85-90% goal range

### Inspection Pass Rates for May, 2012:

OVERALL MONTHLY AV'G @ 84.4%, compared to 86.09% in April

**Bldg:** April – 80.82%      **Elec:** April – 84.72%  
May – 78.05%      May – 83.24%

**Mech:** April – 89.22%      **Plbg:** April – 92.37%  
May – 88.19%      May – 90.62%

- All down; Bldg down 3%, Elec down 1.5%, Mech down 1%, Plbg down 1.7%
- Still well above 75-80% goal range

### OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for May, 2012:

#### CTAC:

- 220 first reviews
- Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 74%
- CTAC was 55% of OnSch (\*) first review volume  $(220/220+178 = 398) = 55.3\%$   
\*CTAC as a % of OnSch is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

#### OnSchedule:

- January, 11: 137- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 82.65% all trades, 83.5% B/E/M/P only
- February, 11: 136- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 86.6% all trades, 88% B/E/M/P only
- March, 11: 185 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 85.75% all trades, 84.5% B/E/M/P only
- April, 11: 147- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 78.37% all trades, 84.8% B/E/M/P only
- May, 11: 196- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 98.5% all trades, 85.5% B/E/M/P only
- June, 11: 251- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.5% all trades, 94.2% B/E/M/P only
- July, 11: 175- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92.25% all trades, 93.75% B/E/M/P only
- August, 11: 238- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95% all trades, 94.75% B/E/M/P only
- Sept, 11: 219 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.25% all trades, 96.5% B/E/M/P only

- October, 11:176 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–96.75% all trades, 96.25% B/E/M/P only
- November, 11:184 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–91.75% all trades, 93.25% B/E/M/P only
- December, 11:143 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–95% all trades, 96% B/E/M/P only
- January, 2012:136 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–78% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- February, 12:139 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–74.88% all trades, 73% B/E/M/P only
- March, 12:127 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–86.25% all trades, 87% B/E/M/P only
- April, 12:151 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–92.25% all trades, 95% B/E/M/P only
- May, 12:195 -1st rev'w projects; on time/early–94.5% all trades, 97% B/E/M/P only

#### Notes regarding on time / early

- OnSchedule and Mega 1<sup>st</sup> review counts way up, from 151 in April to 105 in May. This is primarily in OnSchedule, which went up from 117 in April to 153 in May.
- BEMP on time early average well above goal of 90%.

#### Booking Lead Times

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on April 30, 2012, showed
  - 1-2 hr projects; at 2-3 work day booking lead, but MEP at 11, CMUD at 9, Hlth at 12 days.
  - 3-4 hour projects; at 2 work days lead time, except Elec at 12, M/P at 11, CMUD at 11, CLT Zoning at 19 and & Health at 20 days.
  - 5-8 hour projects; at 3 work days lead time, except MEP at 13, CMUD at 11, CLT Zoning at 20 and Health at 22 days.
- CTAC plan review turnaround time; 2-3 days, except Bldg at 7 days
- Express Review – booking lead time was; 7 work days for small projects, 13 work days for large

## **Status Report on Various Department Initiatives**

### **May Meeting Follow Up**

#### **RDS Turnaround Time**

*Previously covered.*

#### **CSS Report Follow Up**

Jim shared with the BDC that staff met on June 14 to identify topics we think would be ideal for review with a customer focus group, seeking both added perspective as well as ideas on how to move some of the “stuck” issues forward. In addition to this, we developed a tentative list of topics to review with the management team. Our next step is to review both with Ed Gagnon in our upcoming meeting scheduled for July 2 at 10am. Please note that any and all BDC members are welcome. Our plan is to bring something back to you in July's BDC meeting.

#### **Builder Concerns on Final Electrical Connect**

In the May meeting you asked us to focus on Electrical Final Connect issues. Previously when we looked into this issue and discussed/reviewed with our attorney, Marvin Bethune this was found to be prohibited. Permanent power can only be connected after the project complies with all applicable code requirements and all state and local laws. Temporary power approval can be granted for purposes of testing systems and other related purposes necessary for completing the construction. The temporary power process is outlined in article 10 of the NC Electrical code. At our last Building Code Consistency meeting on June 6<sup>th</sup>, we shared handouts/PowerPoint available on our web site to ensure all the homebuilders understand the new procedure. We think the majority of the group was comfortable with the temporary utilities procedures. It was requested that we look again at the ability (and the cost) of streamlining the process that did not require subcontractor signatures on a paper document, as well as for staff to review the fee charged for residential Temp Power. We plan to meet and explore the possibility of automating the process and reviewing the fee charged along with several public representatives who indicated their willingness to be part of that discussion group.

### **MEP Consistency Team Industry Topics**

Last month Joe Weathers talked about consistency issues that he and Willis have raised about being able to get industry topics into the meetings. We met w/ Hal and Zeke today and talked to Ed about it. We've all agreed to a change in our Consistency Team Meeting strategy for MEP. We will now focus quarterly meetings (the date of which will be confirmed and shared with the industry) on industry submitted issues and the other two other meetings outside of the quarterly meeting, we'll focus on staff consistency issues and training identified by our staff or by the CA having issues they choose to train on. This is specific to MEP; Building not included.

### **Other:**

#### **CRWG Public Info Strategy**

Rebecca Simcox shared that the public information strategy for the CRWG changes include the following:

- o 6/6/12 Email blast through Notify Me sent to all customers in NotifyMe
- o 6/6/12 Tutorial placed on website providing clarification on each item listed above.
- o 6/6/12 Tutorial placed on lobby monitors highlighting above items
- o For those into details, all of above linked to CRWG Final Report to BDC, is currently loaded on meckpermit.

Also on web, front page of [www.meckpermit.com](http://www.meckpermit.com) includes topic under "what's new" identifying "Changes to the LUESA Fee Ordinance"; link takes you to the "public announcement" as well as the slide show that showcases the changes. Key items covered include:

- a) J. Morris sound byte
- b) Meck-SI
- c) Equipment cost when included with permitting
- d) Multi-Trade Inspections
- e) Upfit Auto Cost Calculator
- f) Breaking permitted projects apart
- g) Coordinating Project Submittals
- h) County Fire Marshal Plan Review Inspection Fees
- i) Projects with specified inspection counts/limits

## **9. Adjournment**

The June 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

**Note:** The next BDC Meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012.